

Serial No. : 09/752,476  
Filed : January 2, 2001

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 17-20, 22-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383) in view of Crutchfield (www.arichive.org). The examiner rejected Claims 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383) in view of Crutchfield (www.arichive.org) and further in view of official notice. The examiner rejected Claims 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383) in view of Crutchfield (www.arichive.org) and further in view of official notice, and further in view of official notice based on the admitted prior art.

With respect to Claim 17, it is stated that the cited Henson reference shows all of the elements in Claim 17 except for the vehicle information page and that the cited Crutchfield reference shows the vehicle information page that allows the system builder to show the items that fit. The examiner stated that, although the cited references do not specifically depict images of two or more different main systems and two or more different sub-systems, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention as an obvious design choice motivated by prudent business practice.

Accordingly, the applicant has amended Claim 17 to more clearly differentiate the present invention from the technologies disclosed by the cited references. More specifically, the

Serial No. : 09/752,476  
Filed : January 2, 2001

applicant has added the limitations of "wherein information as to whether a special kit is required or not for a particular component is displayed based on the fitment with the customer's vehicle" and "notifying the customer when a combination of components resulted from a selection of component made by the user is incurable". The first feature is supported by the disclosure concerning Figure 8 which includes the display items 96 and 97 showing whether a kit is needed or not for a combination of a particular component and the customer's vehicle and the description at page 12, lines 14-27 which reads as follows:.

By clicking the "Build This System" button 58 in Figure 4 or 5, the system builder moves to the vehicle information page of Figure 7 where the customer provides the information regarding his automobile. As noted above with reference to the flow diagram of Figure 2, the system builder needs to know about the customer's vehicle to determine which components fit and which component do not fit to the customer's vehicle. Each automobile has different sizes in its dashboard, such as 1 DIN or 1.5 DIN frame (DIN: German Industrial Standard), or speaker openings and depths in the front and rear. Such inner sizes may vary depending on make, model and year of the vehicle. Therefore, some components may not be available for his vehicle or need special kits or adapters for installation.

The second feature is supported by the description at page 14, lines 22-32, which reads as follows:

When the recommended components or the suggested add-on components are changed by the customer, the system builder automatically generates a right combination of the products by changing the other components. This is done basically by the vehicle fitment information because the selected component by the customer may not fit to the inner structure of the customer's automobile. Other reason is that the selected component may not be compatible with other components. If the customer's

Serial No. : 09/752,476  
Filed : January 2, 2001

change results in the combination which is incurable, the system builder so notifies the customer.

The cited Crutchfield reference show the web-based online store in which the online store shows components that fits with the customer's vehicle so that the customer can select a component. However, the cited Crutchfield reference does not show the idea of displaying information as to whether a special kit or adapter is required for a particular component. The cited Crutchfield reference does not show the idea of notifying the user that a combination of components selected by the user is incurable. Thus, the newly added features are not shown or suggested by the cited Crutchfield. The cited Henson reference does not show any idea of evaluating the fitment between the customer's vehicle and the components.

In the previous response to the office action, the applicant has added the limitation of "wherein images of two or more different main systems and two or more different sub-systems are displayed during the steps thereby facilitating selection of a desired system" to Claim 17. The limitation is supported by disclosure of the instant application because Figure 3 shows the images of two or more different main systems and Figure 6 shows the images of two or more different sub-systems. The specification with reference to Figures 3 and 6, respectively, describes this features in detail.

The cited Henson reference shows the image of one main system in Fig. 3A, 4, etc., but does not show any images of two or more

Serial No. : 09/752,476  
Filed : January 2, 2001

different main systems. The cited Henson reference does not show any image sub-system let alone images of two or more different sub-systems. For example, the screens of Figs. 3A and 3B for selecting the sub-system do not have any images of sub-systems therein. Therefore, the cited Henson reference does not show the essential feature of the present invention.

The cited Crutchfield reference does not show any concept or distinction between a main system and a sub-system. In the selection process, the online store of the cited Crutchfield reference guides the user to select a manufacturer and a model of the product of a particular manufacturer. Then, the process goes to select the components of the selected model. More importantly, the cited Crutchfield reference does not show any images of two or more different main systems and any images of two or more different sub-system. Therefore, the cited Crutchfield reference does not show the essential feature of the present invention.

The features added in the amendment made concurrently herewith in addition to the features added in the previous response make the present invention more clearly distinguishable from the technologies disclosed by any of the cited references.

As discussed above, the present invention defined in Claim 17 is fully distinguishable from the cited references, and thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is no longer applicable to the invention of Claim 17. Claims 18-29 are dependent upon Claim 17 and defined the features of the present invention with further

Serial No. : 09/752,476  
Filed : January 2, 2001


specificities. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is no longer applicable to the inventions of Claim 18-29.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant believes that Claims 17-29 are in condition for allowance, and accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the present application be allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: 3/21/06

By:   
Yasuo Muramatsu  
Registration No. 38,684  
Attorney of Record  
114 Pacifica, Suite 310  
Irvine, CA 92618  
(949) 753-1127

AMD-AP01.005  
032106